

## **REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

In the Action, Applicants express appreciation to the Office of the indication that Claim 10 includes allowable subject matter, if placed in independent form. Applicants respectfully decline to place Claim 10 in independent form as Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections and believe that the claims are allowable without amendment.

### **Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, 11-15 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

In the Action, Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, 11-15 and 18-20 are rejected as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 7,095,457 to Chou (hereinafter “Chou”). Applicants respectfully disagree with the instant rejection because Chou does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of independent Claim 1.

Claim 1 recites that the backlight unit has a chassis and a bracket for quick installation and removal of the light emitting structure through an aperture that is in the chassis. Claim 1 also recites that the bracket has a support structure that carries the light emitting structure. As further recited in Claim 1, the support structure has a frame for supporting the linear light source and a circuit mount with two portions for supporting the power control circuit. As also recited in Claim 1, the bay positioned within the chassis has a first region and two second regions, wherein the first region receives the support structure frame, and the two second regions receive two portions of the circuit mount of the support structure.

Chou does not disclose or suggest that the bay is within the chassis and includes a first region for receiving the frame of the support structure of the bracket and two second regions for receiving the two portions of the circuit mount and the support structure, respectively.

Chou discloses a detachable rack (30) having a number of illumination units (31) that fits into a guiding groove (11) of a casing (10). A circuit board (40) is in the casing (10). The Office Action states at page 3 that support for the limitation of “a first region” and “two second regions” of Claim 1 can be found at Figs. 2 and 3.

Clearly, Chou does not disclose or suggest that the bracket has a support structure and a bay within the chassis that includes a first region for receiving the support structure and two second portions for receiving the two portions of the circuit mount of the support structure. The opening of Chou (shown as reference numeral 13 in Fig. 2) has the circuit board 40 positioned spaced from the guiding groove 11 and specifically not as claimed. This board 40 would be in the “first region” or, for example, in the groove designed to receive the detachable rack 30 with the illumination units (31) shown in the exploded view. Applicants respectfully submit that the Office is erroneous. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 15 is also patentable as Chou does not disclose or suggest “wherein the bay within the chassis includes a first region for receiving the frame of the support structure and two second regions for receiving the two portions of the circuit mount of the support structure, respectively”. Independent Claim 20 is also similarly patentable as Chou does not disclose or suggest “a circuit mount having two portions for supporting the power control circuit such that the first region of the bay

receives the frame and the two second regions receive the two portions of the circuit mount, respectively". Dependent Claims 3, 4, 7-9 and 11-14 are patentable as these claims depend from independent Claim 1. Dependent Claims 16-19 are patentable as these claim depend from independent Claim 15.

**Rejection of Claims 5-6, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In the Action, Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chou in view of United States Patent No. 6,445,373 to Yamamoto (hereinafter "Yamamoto"). Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection of Claim 5 and traverse the rejection as follows. Applicants submit that the combination of Chou and Yamamoto do not disclose or suggest Claim 5, 6, 16 and 17.

Yamamoto discloses a number of light emitting diodes supported in a frame, which can be slid out of a side of the housing and replaced. Yamamoto does not remedy the deficiencies of Chou as discussed above. Therefore Claim 5 is patentable as it depends from independent Claim 1.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chou in view of Yamamoto in view of United States Patent No. 6,545,732 to Nakano ("hereinafter "Nakano"). Nakano discloses using a rubber mount as a support structure for a lamp. Yamamoto nor Nakano remedy the deficiencies of Chou as discussed above.

In the Action, Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chou in view of United States Patent No. 7,150,557 to Chen (hereinafter "Chen"). Chou, Chen and the combination thereof fail to disclose or suggest that the bay, that is located within the chassis, includes a first region for receiving the

frame of the support structure and two second regions for receiving the two portions of the circuit mount of the support structure.

Chen discloses a backlight module arrangement shown in FIG. 3 and 4. The backlight module 50 is disposed between two LCD panels 60. The module 50 has a frame 52 and lamps 54 fixed to the frame 52. Two electrodes 54A, 54B are exposed outside of the frame 52. Chen does not remedy the deficiencies of Chou as discussed above. Therefore, Claims 16 and 17 are patentable.

In light of the foregoing remarks, reconsideration of, and withdrawal of the rejections and an allowance of the instant patent application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jean-Paul Cass  
Registration No. 46,605

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser, P.C.  
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343  
JPC/PJE:dk